

Remarks

In the Office Action of November 2, 2006, the Examiner (1) rejected claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 14 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,151,661 ("Adams"), (2) rejected claims 4-5 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious under Adams in view of *The Cache Memory Book* ("Handy"), and (3) rejected claims 7-8 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious under Adams in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,065,613 ("Flake"). With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-17, cancel claim 15 and add new claims 19 and 20. Based on the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance.

As amended, claim 1 requires "if the data being removed corresponds to a predetermined word in the dirty cache line, queuing the dirty cache line for replacement and not writing the dirty cache line to a memory external to a processor." No combination of the art of record teaches or suggests this limitation. More particularly, the Examiner admits that "Adams does not specifically address the situation in which a cache line is dirty" (p. 8 of the Office Action of November 2, 2006). Accordingly, the Examiner then turns to Flake, which discloses "...a cache line can be dirty, **and a dirty cache line should be written to memory**" (emphasis added; p. 8 of the Office Action of November 2, 2006 and col. 5, ll. 50-63 of Flake). The Examiner combines Adams with Flake because doing so would allow "data stored in the cache to be transferred to main memory, and therefore not lost" (p. 9 of the same Office Action). The combination of Adams and Flake teaches that "a dirty cache line should be written to memory" in direct and explicit contradiction to claim 1, which requires that the dirty cache line is **not written** to a memory external to a processor. Handy apparently fails to satisfy the deficiencies of the combination of Adams and Flake. At least for these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over all combinations of the art of record.

Independent claims 9 and 17 have been amended to recite limitations similar to those of patentable claim 1. Accordingly, independent claims 9 and 17, as well as all dependent claims 2-8, 10-14, 16 and 18-20, are allowable at least for the same reasons as is claim 1.

**Appl. No. 10/631,205**  
**Amdt. dated December 13, 2006**  
**Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2006**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicants hereby petition for any time extensions that are necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned. In the event that additional fees related to this Amendment, or other transactions in this case, are required (including fees for net addition of claims and for time extension), the Examiner is authorized to charge Texas Instruments Inc.'s Deposit Account No. 20-0668 for such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nick P. Patel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Nick P. Patel  
PTO Reg. No. 57,365  
Conley Rose, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS